



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 09/903,704 | 07/12/2001 | Anthony Scott Moran | AUS920010409US1 | 9196 |

7590 10/17/2006
Robert H. Frantz
P.O. Box 23324
Oklahoma City, OK 73123-2334

EXAMINER

ABRISHAMKAR, KAVEH

| ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
|----------|--------------|
|----------|--------------|

2131

DATE MAILED: 10/17/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

| | | | |
|------------------------------|------------------------|---------------------|--|
| Office Action Summary | Application No. | Applicant(s) | |
| | 09/903,704 | MORAN ET AL. | |
| | Examiner | Art Unit | |
| | Kaveh Abrishamkar | 2131 | |

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 04 August 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-24 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-24 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. This communication is in response to the amendment received on August 4, 2006. Claims 1-24 are currently pending consideration.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments filed August 4, 2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive for the following reasons:

Regarding the independent claim 1, the Applicant argues that the Cited Prior Art (CPA), Trabelsi (US 2001/0056494), does not teach the reuse of a finite number of "action indicators" in association with a plurality of "action group tags" or "action group containers", wherein each action indicator combined with the group tag or container can be assigned a unique permission. This argument is not persuasive. Based on the broadest reasonable interpretation, each action group tag, can be interpreted as the roles as specified in paragraph 34. Each role (action group tag) can perform a number of different actions based on permissions (paragraphs 34 and 43-44). The rights or resource can be grouped as well by keywords, or characters (action indicators) wherein wildcards can be used as well so that each character can be coupled with a wildcard to effectively be reused amongst different permissions (paragraph 43). These action indicators can be reused among the different generic groups as delineated in paragraph

Art Unit: 2131

43. The applicant argues that the action indicators are or certain actions such as “add”, “attach”, “connect”, “delete”, etc., but though given the broadest reasonable interpretation in light of the specification, the specification is not read into the claims. Furthermore, the Applicant argues the meaning of “action group container” and “action group tags”, but these are not defined in the claims in a way to differentiate over the prior art. The action group container and action group tag, are viewed as analogous to a permission group. Furthermore, the relationship between the action group container, action group tag, access control policy permission list is not well-established through the claim language. Therefore, it is asserted that the CPA does teach the reuse of a finite number of “action indicators” in association with a plurality of “action group tags” or “action group containers”, wherein each action indicator combined with the group tag or container can be assigned a unique permission.

Therefore, the rejection for the pending claims is respectfully maintained as given below.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

3. Claims 1-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Trabelsi (U.S. Patent Publication No. US 2001/0056494 A1).

Regarding claim 1, Trabelsi discloses:

A method for extending and grouping actions and permissions for authorization of a requesting user to access or use a requested protected system resource in a computer system, said method comprising the steps of:

providing an access control policy (paragraph 9) associated with said requested protected system resource, said access control policy containing a permission list of permitted identities (paragraphs 34, 37) for use of said protected system resource, and at least one action group tag and associated action indicators (paragraphs 37, 43-44);

reusing a finite quantity of action indicators among a plurality of action group tags to control a number of unique permissions less than or equal to the product of the quantity of allowable action indicators and a quantity of allowable action group tags (paragraphs 43-44), wherein a group of administrators (paragraphs 5, 34) and the permissions can be grouped into generic groups using special keywords using the alphabetic characters which provide rights;

evaluating said permission list according to a specific permission definition associated with said action group tag, said permission definition providing a correlation between permissible actions and members of a set of action indicators (paragraphs 67-75, wherein the permissions are checked against an access control list which has rights

for the requestor, the authorized actions that can be performed on the resource, and the requested right; and

granting authorization to perform actions on said requested protected system resource to said requesting user if said access control policy permission list includes an appropriate action indicator correlated to an action group tag (paragraphs 70-75), wherein access is granted to perform action on the resource if all the criteria are satisfied in relation to the group and the authorized action.

Claim 2 is rejected as applied above in rejecting claim 1. Furthermore, Trabelsi discloses:

The method as set forth in claim 1 further comprising providing in an access control policy permission list a plurality of action group tags, each action group tag having one or more associated action indicators, such that resultant granting of authorization to act on said requested protected object is completed if the requested action is allowed by any of the associated action indicators of any of the action groups (paragraphs 70-75), wherein access is granted to perform action on the resource if all the criteria are satisfied in relation to the group and the authorized action.

Claim 3 is rejected as applied above in rejecting claim 2. Furthermore, Trabelsi discloses:

The method as set forth in claim 1, wherein said requested protected system resource comprises a computer file sent to a local computer from a remote computer

over a computer network (paragraph 68), wherein the requested resource can be a database file.

Regarding claim 4, Trabelsi discloses:

A method for managing permission indicators for computer system protected objects comprising the steps of:

providing a plurality of permission indicator containers in an access control list (paragraphs 9, 34, 37);

associating a first set of permission indicators with a primary permission indicator container (paragraphs 5, 34), wherein the group identifier specifies what privileges and rights the requestor possesses; and

associating one or more additional sets of permission indicators with additional permission indicator containers (paragraphs 34, 43-44), wherein said permission indicators are reused among said containers such that permission indicators may be categorized and grouped logically to control a number of unique permissions less than or equal to the product of a quantity of allowable action indicators and a quantity of allowable action group tags (paragraphs 43-44), wherein a group of administrators (paragraphs 5, 34) and the permissions can be grouped into generic groups using special keywords using the alphabetic characters which provide rights.

Claim 5 is rejected as applied above in rejecting claim 4. Furthermore, Trabelsi discloses:

The method as set forth in claim 4 wherein said step of providing a first set of permission indicators comprises providing at least one other (additional) permission indicator set having equivalent permission indicators to said first set such that permission indicators may be assigned unique permissive control according to a permission indicator container with which they are associated (paragraphs 34-39), wherein a group identifier may specify one or more roles with each role possessing its own permission indicators.

Claim 6 is rejected as applied above in rejecting claim 5. Furthermore, Trabelsi discloses:

The method as set forth in claim 5 wherein said step of providing an equivalent set of permission indicators comprises providing the characters "a" through "z" and "A" through "Z" as permission indicators (paragraphs 43-44), wherein keywords and alphabetic characters are used to provide certain permission indicators to access different resources.

Claim 7 is rejected as applied above in rejecting claim 4. Furthermore, Trabelsi discloses:

The method as set forth in claim 4 further comprising associating an action group tag with a permission indicator container (paragraphs 8, 34-38), wherein a group identifier can be associated with a number of different roles and different roles.

Claim 8 is rejected as applied above in rejecting claim 7. Furthermore, Trabelsi discloses:

The method as set forth in claim 7 further comprising the step of providing an action group tag with an associated list of permission indicators in an access control list entry (paragraphs 43-45, 67-70), wherein an group identifier is associated with different permission indicators which are checked when a resource is requested.

Regarding claim 9, Trabelsi discloses:

A computer readable medium encoded with software or extending and grouping actions and permissions for authorization of a requesting user to access or use a requested protected system resource in a computer system, said software performing steps comprising:

providing an access control policy (paragraph 9) associated with said requested protected system resource containing a permission list of permitted identities (paragraphs 34, 37) and at least one action group tag with associated action indicators (paragraphs 37,43-44);

reusing a finite quantity of action indicators among a plurality of action group tags to control a number of unique permissions less than or equal to the product of the quantity of allowable action indicators and a quantity of allowable action group tags (paragraphs 43-44), wherein a group of administrators (paragraphs 5, 34) and the permissions can be grouped into generic groups using special keywords using the alphabetic characters which provide rights;

evaluating said permission list according to a specific permission definition associated with said action group tag, said permission definition providing a correlation between members of a set of action indicators (paragraphs 67-75, wherein the permissions are checked against an access control list which has rights for the requestor, the authorized actions that can be performed on the resource, and the requested right; and

granting authorization to perform actions on said requested protected system resource to said requesting user if said access control policy permission list includes an appropriate action indicator correlated to an action group tag (paragraphs 70-75), wherein access is granted to perform action on the resource if all the criteria are satisfied in relation to the group and the authorized action.

Claim 10 is rejected as applied above in rejecting claim 9. Furthermore, Trabelsi discloses:

The computer readable medium as set forth in claim 9 further comprising software for providing in an access control policy permission list a plurality of action group tags, each action group tag having one or more associated action indicators, such that resultant granting of authorization to act on said requested protected object is completed if the requested action is allowed by any of the associated action indicators of any of the action groups (paragraphs 70-75), wherein access is granted to perform action on the resource if all the criteria are satisfied in relation to the group and the authorized action.

Claim 11 is rejected as applied above in rejecting claim 9. Furthermore, Trabelsi discloses:

The computer readable medium as set forth in claim 9 wherein said requested protected system resource comprises a computer file sent to a local computer from a remote computer over a computer network (paragraph 68), wherein the requested resource can be a database file.

Regarding claim 12, Trabelsi discloses:

A computer readable medium encoded with software for managing permission indicators for computer system protected objects, said software performing the steps of:
providing a plurality of permission indicator containers in an access control list (paragraphs 9, 34, 37);

associating a first set of permission indicators with a primary permission indicator container (paragraphs 5, 34), wherein the group identifier specifies what privileges and rights the requestor possesses; and

associating one or more additional sets of permission indicators with additional permission indicator containers (paragraphs 34, 43-44), wherein said permission indicators are reused among said containers such that permission indicators may be categorized and grouped logically to control a number of unique permissions less than or equal to the product of a quantity of allowable action indicators and a quantity of allowable action group tags (paragraphs 43-44), wherein a group of administrators

(paragraphs 5, 34) and the permissions can be grouped into generic groups using special keywords using the alphabetic characters which provide rights.

Claim 13 is rejected as applied above in rejecting claim 12. Furthermore, Trabelsi discloses:

The computer readable medium as set forth in claim 12 wherein said software for providing a first set of permission indicators comprises software for providing permission indicators which are equivalent to at least one other (additional) permission indicators such that permission indicators may be assigned unique permissive control according to a permission indicator container with which they are associated (paragraphs 34-39), wherein a group identifier may specify one or more roles with each role possessing its own permission indicators.

Claim 14 is rejected as applied above in rejecting claim 13. Furthermore, Trabelsi discloses:

The computer readable medium as set forth in claim 13 wherein said software for providing equivalent permission indicators comprises software for providing a set of permission indicators including the characters "a" through "z" and "A" through "Z" (paragraphs 43-44), wherein keywords and alphabetic characters are used to provide certain permission indicators to access different resources.

Claim 15 is rejected as applied above in rejecting claim 12. Furthermore, Trabelsi discloses:

The computer readable medium as set forth in claim 12 further comprising software for associating an action group tag with a permission indicator container (paragraphs 8, 34-38), wherein a group identifier can be associated with a number of different roles and different roles.

Claim 16 is rejected as applied above in rejecting claim 15. Furthermore, Trabelsi discloses:

The computer readable medium as set forth in claim 15 further comprising software for providing an action group tag with an associated list of permission indicators in an access control list entry (paragraphs 43-45, 67-70), wherein an group identifier is associated with different permission indicators which are checked when a resource is requested.

Regarding claim 17, Trabelsi discloses:

An authorization system for extending and grouping actions and permissions for authorization of a requesting user to access or use a requested protected system resource in a computer system, said system comprising:

an access control policy (paragraph 9) associated with said requested protected system resource, having a permission list of permitted identities (paragraphs 34, 37) and at least one action group tag with associated action indicators wherein a finite

quantity of action indicators are reused among a plurality of action group tags to control a number of unique permissions less than or equal to the product of the quantity of allowable action indicators and a quantity of allowable action group tags (paragraphs 43-44), wherein a group of administrators (paragraphs 5, 34) and the permissions can be grouped into generic groups using special keywords using the alphabetic characters which provide rights;

a permission list evaluator for evaluating an access control policy permission list according to a specific permission definition associated with said action group tag, said permission definition providing a correlation between members of a set of action indicators (paragraphs 67-75, wherein the permissions are checked against an access control list which has rights for the requestor, the authorized actions that can be performed on the resource, and the requested right; and

an authorization grantor adapted to grant authorization to perform actions on said requested protected system resource to said requesting user if said access control policy permission list includes an appropriate action indicator correlated to an action group tag (paragraphs 70-75), wherein access is granted to perform action on the resource if all the criteria are satisfied in relation to the group and the authorized action.

Claim 18 is rejected as applied above in rejecting claim 17. Furthermore, Trabelsi discloses:

The system as set forth in claim 17 further wherein said access control policy permission list comprises a plurality of action group tags, each action group tag having

one or more associated action indicators, such that resultant granting of authorization to act on said requested protected object is completed if the requested action is allowed by any of the associated action indicators of any of the action groups (paragraphs 70-75), wherein access is granted to perform action on the resource if all the criteria are satisfied in relation to the group and the authorized action.

Claim 19 is rejected as applied above in rejecting claim 17. Furthermore, Trabelsi discloses:

The system as set forth in Claim 17 wherein the requested protected system resource comprises a computer file sent to a local computer from a remote computer over a computer network (paragraph 68), wherein the requested resource can be a database file.

Regarding claim 20, Trabelsi discloses:

A system for managing permission indicators for computer system protected objects comprising:

a plurality of permission indicator containers for an access control list (paragraphs 34, 37);

a first set of permission indicators associated with a primary permission indicator container (paragraphs 37, 43-44); and

one or more additional sets of permission indicators (paragraphs 34-39), associated with additional permission indicator containers, wherein such permission

indicators are reused among said containers such that permission indicators are categorized and grouped logically to control a number of unique permissions less than or equal to the product of a quantity of allowable action indicators and a quantity of allowable action group tags (paragraphs 43-44), wherein a group of administrators (paragraphs 5, 34) and the permissions can be grouped into generic groups using special keywords using the alphabetic characters which provide rights.

Claim 21 is rejected as applied above in rejecting claim 20. Furthermore, Trabelsi discloses:

The system as set forth in claim 20 wherein said a first set of permission indicators and at least one other (additional) permission indicator set are equivalent permission indicators such that permission indicators are assigned unique permissive control according to the permission indicator container with which they are associated (paragraphs 34-39), wherein a group identifier may specify one or more roles with each role possessing its own permission indicators.

Claim 22 is rejected as applied above in rejecting claim 21. Furthermore, Trabelsi discloses:

The system as set forth in claim 21 wherein said equivalent set of permission indicators comprises the characters "a" through "z" and "A" through "Z" (paragraphs 43-44), wherein keywords and alphabetic characters are used to provide certain permission indicators to access different resources.

Claim 23 is rejected as applied above in rejecting claim 20. Furthermore, Trabelsi discloses:

The system as set forth in claim 20 further comprising an action group tag associated with a permission indicator container (paragraphs 8, 34-38), wherein a group identifier can be associated with a number of different roles and different roles.

Claim 24 is rejected as applied above in rejecting claim 23. Furthermore, Trabelsi discloses:

The system as set forth in claim 23 further comprising an action group tag associated with a list of permission indicators in an access control list entry (paragraphs 43-45, 67-70), wherein an group identifier is associated with different permission indicators which are checked when a resource is requested.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the

Art Unit: 2131

shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kaveh Abrishamkar whose telephone number is 571-272-3786. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday thru Friday 8-5.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ayaz Sheikh can be reached on 571-272-3795. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

K.A.
10/12/2006

